

213 F.3d 1006, 1010 (8th Cir. 2000). Defendant represents that, upon review, agency counsel determined that remand is necessary “for further evaluation of Plaintiff’s claim.” [ECF No. 13] More specifically, Defendant states that on remand the ALJ will (1) “[o]btain vocational expert testimony and obtain an explanation of apparent conflict between the testimony and Dictionary of Occupational Titles[,]” (2) “[o]ffer Plaintiff the opportunity for a hearing, (3) “take further action to complete the administrative record,” and (4) issue a new decision. [ECF No. 13]

Based on the record, the Court grants Defendant’s unopposed motion to reverse the ALJ’s decision and remand this matter to Defendant for further proceedings pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant’s unopposed motion to reverse and remand [ECF No. 13] is **GRANTED**.

A separate judgment in accordance with this Memorandum and Order is entered this date.



PATRICIA L. COHEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated this 11th day of July, 2024